

bulletin





The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XX, No. 502 • PUBLICATION 3427

February 13, 1949

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$5, foreign \$7.25
Single copy, 15 cents

Published with the approval of the
Director of the Bureau of the Budget

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

FEB 24 '49

AN AMERICAN ANSWER TO CHINESE COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

ADDRESS BY JOHN M. CABOT¹

Consul General, American Embassy, Shanghai

Did any of you read the January 14 message from the Chinese political leader who has figured rather prominently in the news recently? Let me give you some excerpts.

"Two and a half years have elapsed since July 1946, when the Nanking Kuomintang reactionary government with the aid of American imperialists and in violation of the will of the people tore up the truce agreement . . . and launched a nation-wide counter-revolutionary civil war. During these two and a half years' war the Nanking KMT reactionary government in violation of the will of the people . . . betrayed the national rights wholesale to the American Government and obtained several billion dollars in foreign loans from the American Government. It brought in the American Government's naval and air forces to occupy China's territory, territorial seas, and to encroach on her air sovereignty. This Government concluded many treaties of national betrayal with the American Government and accepted the American Military Advisory Group's participation in China's civil war. It obtained from the American Government large quantities of planes, tanks, heavy and light artillery, machine guns, rifles, shells, ammunition, and other military materials for slaughter of the Chinese people."

At that point the political leader stopped his attacks on American imperialism. Perhaps because he was out of breath, although he did later specify abrogation of treaties of national betrayal as one condition for negotiation of peace.

Now that's a pretty formidable indictment of all the things the American Government has been doing in China in the last two and a half years, and it's only part of what the North Shensi radio has been saying. Patriotic Chinese and good American citizens here today would certainly want to know about such nefarious doings on the

part of the American Government. Since this is a University gathering in which a belief in academic freedom has been instilled, you will want the more to know what the truth is. So let's look at the record. It is too bad that the distinguished leader I quote was rather short on facts and long on invective. Perhaps we can fill in the gaps in the facts.

The message shows a touching regard for the will of the people by twice referring to it in the short excerpt I quoted. It must refer to the will of the Chinese people. But I wonder how he knows what their will is. In the United States we can pretty well determine what the will of the people is—and I'm not referring to the Gallup poll. We know for example that the American people wanted Truman for President. We know that he and not Henry Wallace received the support of organized labor. It is generally believed that most of the Wall Street bankers, whom North Shensi radio is so fond of castigating, were opposed to Truman's election. We can therefore be fairly certain that when Mr. Truman's administration sponsors aid to the National Government of China, it does so because the American people, and not Wall Street bankers, want it to do so.

But has the eminent political leader I have quoted any similar means of knowing what the will of the Chinese people is? Have Chinese Communists ever conducted a free election in the territory they control? Has any Communist regime ever conducted a free election or come to power in a free election in any country? The Czechs and Hungarians and a dozen other peoples might wish to give evidence regarding this. Let the Chinese Communists secure a mandate from the Chinese people in free elections before they

¹ Address delivered before the American University Club in Shanghai on Jan. 26, 1949. Printed from telegraphic text.

reproach the United States for flouting the people's will.

The message next refers to the wholesale betrayal of Chinese national rights to the American Government. In the absence of more specific charges this one is a little like the old have-you-stopped-beating-your-wife joke. But perhaps this is merely an introduction to later accusations. Let me say however that the United States is scrupulously respecting Chinese sovereignty and would not ask the Chinese Government or any other government to betray its national rights. We are not seeking in China any privileged position *vis-à-vis* either the Chinese or any other nation.

The next item is more specific: The National government "obtained several billion dollars in foreign loans from the American Government." Now the curious thing about that one is that the United States hasn't loaned a single dollar to the Chinese Government since July 1946. On the contrary, we refused to continue with the proposed U. S. \$500,000,000 Export-Import Bank credit. Even Communist propaganda puts our total aid to China since V-J Day at only U.S. \$4,000,000,000, a greatly inflated figure, and most of this is nonreimbursable. Of our aid agreements I shall speak shortly.

The next item on the bill of particulars is "it brought in the American Government's naval and air forces to occupy China's territory, territorial seas, and to encroach on her air sovereignty." Have the Communists forgotten these forces came to China to assist in liberating its territory from the Japanese? Do they think these forces will remain any longer than the recognized Chinese authorities wish them to? Moreover we should like to hear about the position of the Chinese Communists on the occupation of Dairen by a foreign power. Then too do they accept the present status of Port Arthur? Agreeing as we do with Chinese Communists regarding the evils of imperialism, we feel that these cases merit their early attention. Here indeed are foreign troops which seem to be settling down for a long stay on Chinese soil.

The message next complains that American planes encroach upon China's air sovereignty. No flight of any American Government plane was ever made to China without the explicit consent of constituted authorities. Our planes fly over

British territory, and foreign planes fly over American territory on exactly the same conditions without any feeling that they encroach upon British or American sovereignty, respectively. We have neither asked for nor received any special air rights anywhere in China. We would however like to know how the Chinese Communists view the agreement imposed on China by another power under which even the Chinese Government could not give its consent to the proposed flight of an American Embassy plane.

The bill of particulars now comes to "many treaties of national betrayal with the American Government," and later demands their abrogation. Our two most recent treaties with China are those signed in 1943 and 1946. By the first we abandoned our extraterritorial rights and our rights in port concessions. If the Chinese Communists consider this treaty a national betrayal and try to abrogate it, I wish to make quite clear to them that we will refuse to take back our extraterritorial rights and port concessions—we are glad these infringements on Chinese sovereignty have been ended.

Our other recent treaty, the commercial treaty of 1946 which went into effect only on November 30 last, expressly superseded all of the unequal treaties which still existed. It was designed to replace them with a treaty which should give recognition to China's just demands for equal treatment in agreements with foreign powers. It was the first equal commercial treaty ever negotiated by the Chinese Government. I cannot say whether the distinguished leader considers this an unequal treaty since he fails to specify treaties to which he objects and the provisions in them to which he takes exception. But if it is to this one, then he and many American businessmen in Shanghai are in complete agreement in considering it unfair. But then in the United States, when we hear objections to both sides, we generally feel we have attained a pretty fair middle-of-the-road position.

We have also made several executive agreements with China in the postwar period. One of these was the surplus property agreement of 1946, in which we agreed to turn over some U.S. \$500,000,000 worth of surplus materials (from which, be it emphasized, guns, munitions, military airplanes, and other combatant materials were expressly excluded), together with other items, in return primarily for cancellation of the indebted-

ness our armed forces had incurred in China. Do the Chinese Communists complain because we did not ask China to pay for the upkeep of our forces in China as we asked our other allies to pay for the upkeep of our forces on their territory in part compensation for our lend-lease assistance? This is certainly a most striking example of "inequality" which appears in many of our recent agreements with China.

Under the surplus property agreement, the Chinese Government agreed to set aside U.S. \$20,000,000 in Chinese currency in order that it might not be a burden on the Chinese economy and in order to establish an educational foundation. Perhaps this is a shocking example of American "cultural imperialism" since the money was almost all spent in China. Yet even the Chinese Communists do not criticize the money our missionaries have spent for education over years in China with noble intent and loving care. It is nevertheless rather tragic to think that in the Communist concept trade in ideas is contraband.

I do not think that the message can refer to the air transport agreement of 1946 as a treaty of national betrayal. It is completely reciprocal in language, and each party grants the other entry over three international routes. The fact is that this agreement has greatly improved China's international communications.

Perhaps the Communists are referring to our aid agreements as treaties of national betrayal. Here is where Communist propaganda really pulls out all stops in denouncing American "imperialism"—it claims our aid program a trap (1) to enslave the Chinese worker and (2) to get rid of our surpluses in order to hold together for a while longer the tottering structure of our capitalistic economy. Chinese Communists are again very unhelpful in failing to expand these thoughts. Probably they have discovered they don't have to prove their points where free speech doesn't exist. In any case, they don't explain why it is improper for the United States to aid the Chinese Government, which is recognized by all other governments, including the Soviet Union, as the sole legitimate authority in China.

The facts regarding our aid program are very simple. We have signed agreements by which we tried to insure aid which will truly benefit the Chinese people. The small group of Americans

who have been insisting we should grant aid only with political strings attached will doubtless be moved to tears to discover that they "done us wrong." If Communist propaganda is to be believed, we have unbeknownst to the public at large been able to wring major political concessions from the National Government. Alas, I must disabuse this idea. We have granted aid without thought of political considerations. The Chinese Government will be under no enduring obligation to the U.S. when the aid program is finished. As traditional friends we are giving aid without insisting on more in return. Those agreements under which we have extended aid to China are intended to help the Chinese laborer. They are furnishing food for his family, fuel in the factories in which he works, and cotton to keep those factories running and to clothe him. There are millions of dollars of food and fuel and cotton in Shanghai today which are being given by the United States to the Chinese people with no thought of material recompense. The American people will be satisfied if this help aids the Chinese people. The last thing on earth they want is to take advantage of China's distress and secure selfish privileges in this country.

Perhaps the Chinese Communists will answer a question in this connection. Rather than American aid, which is bringing hundreds of millions of dollars of materials into the country without compensation, do they prefer the aid a foreign power gave in Manchuria by taking from the country everything which wasn't nailed down and quite a bit that was? That kind of "aid" cost China some two billion dollars in machinery and other items.

I have noted Communist propaganda deriding comments by Mr. Hoffman, Eca head, regarding the possibility of furnishing American aid to Communist-dominated areas. This propaganda denounced Mr. Hoffman for suggesting that aid might be granted if Eca officials were permitted to supervise it and enjoy the right of full publicity respecting it. My last post was in a Communist country in southeastern Europe. There UNRRA aid was used by the Communist regime to reward the faithful and to punish the unbelievers. Government propaganda blatantly claimed for the government credit for this aid while damning the United States and Great Britain which had furnished over 90 percent. Is that why Chinese Communists consider that it would be derogatory

to China's sovereignty to accept Mr. Hoffman's conditions?

Our aid program also includes a rural reconstruction agreement. I do not know whether the Communists will claim that this is just another "imperialistic" scheme to stunt the growth of Chinese crops or to sell American farm machinery to Chinese farmers. I do know that that is not our concept. What we want is to help the Chinese farmer make the best possible use of his tragically limited acres. If Communists consider that agreement a national betrayal, let them make the most of it.

In summary, it would be helpful if Communist propaganda would explain what material profit we hope to get by giving China immense quantities of our products. No nation ever got rich by that. It would be equally helpful if it would explain how we expect to advance our "imperialistic" design of enslaving the Chinese worker by furnishing him with food, fuel, and raw materials with which to work without attaching any permanent strings to the aid we are giving.

Moreover, it seems fair to ask how it was proposed that these treaties be abrogated. The treaty of 1943 for obvious reasons contains no provision for abrogation. The 1946 treaty cannot be abrogated for five years. We cannot imagine that Chinese Communists would wish to become, like Hitler, avowed treaty breakers. Treaties should be abrogated only under their own provisions or by mutual consent.

Since we are on the subject of unequal treaties, it would be helpful if we could be told what Chinese Communists plan to do about the Sino-Soviet treaty of 1945. Here indeed is a classic example of an unequal treaty—so far as I know the only important treaty of that nature to which China is still a party—for it gives a foreign power specific privileges on Chinese soil. When people in the United States hear Chinese Communists denouncing treaties of national betrayal, they will probably be prepared to accept the sincerity of such denouncements when the Chinese Communists abrogate the Sino-Soviet treaty of 1945. It is a curious fact that the United States seems more criticized in China for having recommended a treaty for fear of something worse, than is the country which imposed this treaty on China in the classical tradition of nineteenth century imperialism.

We seem to have strayed rather far from the message we are discussing, so let us return. The next allegation is that the American Military Advisory Group is participating in China's civil war. It would be interesting to know on what evidence this statement was made. Did Communists capture American officers helping Nationalists at Tsinan or Chinchow or Mukden or Hsuechow or Tientsin? The fact is that Communists know that American advisory groups have not participated in the civil war. Their orders have strictly forbidden them to participate in it. The United States does not want authority in China, and it does not want responsibility without authority. Advisory groups were sent to China before mediation broke down to implement a long-range program which would make another aggressor think twice before repeating Japan's mistake. They came to China with full agreement of the Communists and with the intention, thwarted by renewed outbreak of civil war, that Communist forces should be included in its training program. Surely Communists know better than to think National military operations would have been so botched if American advisory groups had been running them.

We next come to this business of planes, tanks, artillery, etc., which we furnished Chinese Nationals. The fact here is that most of the American equipment the Nationals used had been provided before July 1946. It had been sent by the United States to help China crush Japanese aggression and prevent its recurrence rather than with any thought that it would be used in civil war. Chinese Communists should not forget that only four years ago the United States was engaging in the common cause with the Kuomintang and the Chinese Communists alike against the Axis—just as we who oppose Communism must not forget the many heroic deeds of the Chinese Communists in the war against Japan or their many services in our common cause.

Having reequipped a large part of the Chinese National forces before July 1946 with American arms, we could scarcely deny a government which had cooperated with us in that program the right to buy munitions for these arms. Nor did we wish to when the opposing faction followed more and more slavishly a party line of a foreign power. We made clear in 1900 our opposition to domination of China by any foreign imperialism and we have fol-

lowed the same policy ever since. We have believed this served China's interests as well as our own and continue to believe so. It was not then for slaughter of the Chinese people that we furnished these arms. It was for their freedom, for the preservation of their independence against any foreign nation, Japan or any other which might seek to dominate them. We did not wish China, like many an ancient land in Europe, to fall beneath the heel of foreign tyranny against the will of their people.

Implicit in the whole message from which I have quoted is the idea that the Kuomintang is subservient to the United States—that the Kuomintang authorities are our puppets or running dogs. Should anyone have this idea I suggest he read General Stilwell's book which shows the extent to which our military commander in this theater was not heeded. Or he might read the leading Kuomintang organs in this city, which regularly criticize the United States more than they do Soviet Russia.

I have a question to ask the Chinese Communists in this connection.

In June of 1948 the Cominform published a communiqué denouncing Tito and other leaders of the Yugoslav Government. You will say Yugoslavia is far off and ask what it has to do with China. In that communiqué the Cominform made it very clear that Tito's crime had been to refuse to fol-

low blindly orders from the Politburo in Moscow—that he had insisted on his own right to interpret Marx and Lenin—that he had insisted on upholding Yugoslavia's interests—that he had, to take a specific instance, formed a coalition with non-Communists in the national liberation front which ran Yugoslavia. For this he was called a Trotskyite, a deviationist.

The Chinese Communist Party has publicly and unreservedly endorsed that communiqué.

Now my question is: Does the Chinese Communist Party blindly follow orders from Moscow or does it not? They surely cannot take it amiss if we infer from their endorsement of this communiqué (and much of the evidence) that they do. The United States does not believe that the Chinese people want to be ruled by orders from any foreign capital and in accordance with its traditional friendship, the United States has furnished aid to them to prevent this. If we have not furnished more aid, it has been due more to our doubts as to its effective use than to a lack of desire to help. We have not wanted to offend China's sovereignty by telling the Chinese Government how it should run its affairs. Those who accuse American "imperialism" of seeking to run China would do well to explain whether or not they themselves are accepting guidance from another foreign power.

Disarmament

The Security Council devoted its meetings on February 8 and 10 to a consideration of the General Assembly resolution on disarmament. The resolution, which had been sponsored by the Belgian and French Delegations and which passed the Assembly on November 19, 1948, recommended that the Security Council, through its Commission for Conventional Armaments, conduct a survey of the existing level of armaments among nations, as the initial step in formulating a disarmament program.

Criticizing the resolution as "generalized and non-concrete," the Soviet Representative, Mr. Malik, offered a separate draft resolution. The Soviet-sponsored measure pointed to activities which it said were leading to the "unleashing of a new war"; it spoke of the creation of a number of "grouping of states" headed by the "aggressive circles of certain Great Powers", of the failure to implement earlier Assembly resolutions concerning the control of atomic energy and the reduction of armaments. According to Mr. Malik's draft, the Security Council would instruct the Commission for Conventional Armaments to present by June 1, 1949, a plan by which the armaments and armed forces of the five permanent members of the Council would be reduced by one third as of March 1, 1950; further, that the Atomic Energy Commission be instructed to work out a draft convention for the prohibition of atomic weapons and a draft convention for the control of atomic energy, to be enacted simultaneously; and that an international control organ be created under the Security Council to supervise the implementation of these measures. The Soviet draft resolution also proposed that permanent members of the Security Council submit to that body by March 31 full data regarding their armed forces and all armaments, including atomic weapons.

In reply to the Soviet draft resolution, which was presented orally, Ambassador Austin pointed out that it was composed of a number of proposals which had been previously discussed and rejected by various organs of the United Nations, including the General Assembly. He spoke of the repetition of these once-rejected proposals as an obstruction to the passage of the first essential step toward a genuine disarmament program: the collection of information about the existing level of armaments. Ambassador Austin asserted that the United States was prepared to report on and allow verification of its effectives and conventional armaments, in accordance with the terms of the General Assembly resolution, and he inquired whether the Soviet Union would be willing to extend similar measures of cooperation.

In reply to certain charges of the Soviet Representative, Ambassador Austin quoted a statement

by Secretary Acheson, issued on January 26, which referred to the proposed Atlantic Pact as a "collective defense arrangement" within the framework of the United Nations.

The remarks of Ambassador Austin were endorsed by the Representative of Great Britain, who warned that "the practice of reviving defeated projects" could lead to "protracted confusion" in the debates of the Commission for Conventional Armaments.

At the following meeting, on February 10, the United States submitted a motion transmitting the General Assembly resolution to the Commission for Conventional Armaments. This was passed by a vote of 9-0, with the Soviet Union and Ukraine abstaining. The Soviet resolution was defeated, 2-0, with 9 states abstaining, and a proposal by Mr. Malik that the Soviet resolution be transmitted to the Commission for Conventional Armaments along with the General Assembly resolution, was likewise defeated by a vote of 3-0, with 8 states abstaining.

Trusteeship Council

The Trusteeship Council, in the third week of its fourth regular session, devoted a major share of its time to the consideration of petitions from inhabitants of trust territories. One of the principal points of controversy was the status before the Council of anonymous petitions, which Belgium and France contended should not be classed as petitions at all. Decision in the matter was deferred indefinitely.

Controversy also arose when the United Kingdom and Belgium sought postponements of consideration of the report of the Council's visiting mission to Tanganyika and Ruanda-Urundi on the ground they had not sufficient time to prepare a reply. In the end, the Council accepted the suggestion of the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Sayre, that a "preliminary" examination of the report be undertaken later in the session.

The report of the administering authority on the French Cameroons was the first of the annual reports to be taken up.

Economic and Social Council

The eighth session of the Economic and Social Council opened February 7 with public interest centered on steps toward implementation of the cooperative program suggested by President Truman for technical assistance in the development of underdeveloped areas. Discussions of these and other economic matters was deferred, however, for at least two weeks.

James Thorn of New Zealand was elected president of the Council; V. V. Skorobogaty of Byelorussia, first vice president; and Dr. Carlos Eduardo Stolk of Venezuela, second vice president. Willard L. Thorp, Assistant Secretary of

State, is the United States Representative and Leroy D. Stinebower and Walter M. Kotschnig, Deputy Representatives.

The following actions were taken during the week:

Freedom of information.—The resolution of the Geneva Conference on Freedom of Information providing for a three-year continuation of the Subcommittee on Freedom of Information was referred to the Social Committee along with proposed U. S. amendments. The amendments would not change the suggested terms of reference of the subcommittee but would hasten its reorganization and work program under the new terms of reference.

Human rights.—General Assembly resolutions on the right of petition and the problems of minorities were transmitted to the Human Rights Commission. A decision on the inclusion of court decisions in the *Human Rights Yearbook* was postponed until the ninth session. This discussion was aggravated by references to the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary and the trial of eleven Communists in New York. June 13 was set as the date for the opening of the next meeting of the Subcommittee on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.

In the Ecosoc Social Committee, U.S. resolutions were adopted on arrangements between the Council and the Permanent Central Opium Board, and on the selection of an expert panel to study the effects of the chewing of the cocoa leaf.

Dr. Jessup Named Ambassador-at-Large

President Truman sent to the Senate for confirmation on February 10, the nomination of Dr. Philip C. Jessup to be Ambassador-at-Large. Dr. Jessup, who had been serving as Deputy United States Representative to the Security Council and the Interim Committee of the General Assembly, will serve the Secretary of State on special assignment to international meetings, including the General Assembly.

To fill the vacancies created by this appointment, the President nominated John C. Ross as Deputy United States Representative in the Security Council, and Charles P. Noyes as Deputy U. S. Representative in the Interim Committee of the General Assembly.

Korea

The "Democratic People's Republic of Korea" submitted in a letter dated January 19 from the Acting Foreign Minister a formal application to the Secretary-General for membership in the United Nations. In view of paragraph 2 of the General Assembly Resolution of December 12, 1948, the Secretary-General circulated the application on February 10 for the convenience of the members of the Security Council rather than

under rule 6 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Council. Paragraph 2 "declared that there has been established a lawful government (the government of the Republic of Korea) having effective control and jurisdiction over that part of Korea where the Temporary Commission was able to observe and consult and in which the great majority of the people of all Korea reside; that this Government is based on elections which were a valid expression of the free will of the electorate of that part of Korea and which were observed by the Temporary Commission; and that this is the only such Government in Korea." Rule 6 provides that the Secretary-General shall bring to the attention of all representatives on the Council all communications from states, organs of the U.N., or the Secretary-General, concerning any matter for the consideration of the Security Council in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

The application for membership from the Republic of Korea will be considered at an early Security Council meeting.

ILO

Training programs and techniques developed by government, management, and labor in the United States to supply American industry with skilled man power are described in a study just published by the ILO entitled "Vocational Training of Adults in the United States." This is one in a series of monographs intended to serve as guides to countries urgently in need of skilled man power to carry out plans for economic development. The studies are part of ILO's broad man-power program aimed at more efficient use of the world's labor resources.

Indonesia

The Commission for Indonesia invited the Netherlands and Republican Delegations on February 10 to submit any documents or statement which they might consider would assist the Commission in the preparation of its recommendations concerning the formation of a federal interim government.

In this connection the Commission reminded the parties that, under the terms of the Security Council Resolution of January 28, unless the parties have reached agreement on the interim federal government by February 15, the Commission must report to the Security Council and make recommendations for the solution of the difficulties. The viewpoints of the parties will be taken into full consideration, the Commission said.

H. Merle Cochran, U.S. representative on the Commission, is expected to arrive in Batavia on February 14. He departed from Batavia on January 6 for consultations in Washington. En route to Indonesia he has conferred with officials in Belgium and the Netherlands.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Opening of the International Wheat Conference

STATEMENT BY CHARLES F. BRANNAN¹

Secretary of Agriculture

It gives me pleasure to greet you on behalf of the President of the United States and to express our appreciation of the honor which you have paid our Government by allowing us to be host to this conference.

The United States is particularly gratified by the large number of nations represented here. It reflects the growing realization of the need for international cooperation in solving specific economic problems. It also augurs well for the success of our negotiations here.

We have already made great progress. The success of our negotiations last year attest to that point. Furthermore, the consumers and the farmers of the world have become increasingly aware of what a wheat agreement could mean to them. At the recent conference of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, held here in Washington, President Truman, speaking for the people of the United States, gave a very strong endorsement to an international wheat agreement. Government officials of other countries have also expressed the growing interest of their people.

I have spoken of the progress that has been made. I am also very mindful of the importance of our work here. Wheat is the major food item of half the world's population and an important item in the diets of many more. A great many of the world's farmers depend upon it for much of their livelihood. It is the leading food item moving in international trade. So when we meet here in an attempt to draw plans which will stabilize the world's supply and markets for wheat, we are concerning ourselves with the food and livelihood of much of the world's population.

Most of us are keenly aware of what the absence of stability in wheat production and trade can

mean. For importing nations it means insecurity of food supply and the inability to plan ahead. For exporting nations it means insecurity of markets and a comparable inability to plan ahead.

I think that we all recognize the difficulty of the task which is before us. If it were not difficult we would have had an agreement long ago. When we consider the complexity of our world's economy and the differences of domestic programs, of constitutional procedures, and of historical backgrounds, it is not surprising that progress toward an agreement has been slow. Furthermore we were working in a field in which there has been very little previous international experience from which to draw.

Fortunately, we will acquire valuable experience here, for the implications of this conference go far beyond the realm of wheat. Since the end of the war the nations here represented have been struggling to build a firm basis for peace. We have conferred on many problems, political and economic. We have set up valuable machinery for international consultation. Much of our consultation has of necessity been limited to broad, general subjects. Here today, gentlemen, we are tackling a specific problem and attempting to bring some order and stability into the international movement of one of our most basic commodities.

If we can work out a plan and the necessary administrative machinery to stabilize world wheat trading, it should give us experience and hope with which to tackle other problems which now haunt consumers and producers in this complex world of ours.

I am confident that if we work together in the spirit of mutual economic interests, tempered with international understanding, we can work out an agreement which will benefit the people of all the world.

Again may I express a warm welcome from my Government and from the American people, and may I assure you of our earnest desire to do all we can to make your stay here pleasant and the conference a success.

¹ Welcoming statement made by Secretary Brannan on Jan. 26, 1949, at the opening of the Conference in Washington, and released to the press by the International Wheat Conference on the same date. Mr. Brannan served as Temporary Chairman and was later elected Chairman. J. C. Van Essche, Chairman of the Belgian Delegation, and Timothy O'Connell, Chairman of the Irish Delegation, were elected First and Second Vice-Chairmen respectively.

European Broadcasting Conference: Brussels and Copenhagen

BY ROBERT R. BURTON

In 1933 the majority of the nations of Europe met at a regional broadcasting conference in Lucerne to adopt a convention and a plan of frequency distribution. This Lucerne convention and plan were in force until 1939, when a conference was called at Montreux to prepare a new convention and plan. The Montreux convention and plan were signed by delegations representing 35 European nations on April 15, 1939, and the new plan was scheduled to go into effect on March 4, 1940.

Due to the fact that war started in Europe in the fall of 1939, the Montreux plan was never put into effect, and the Lucerne plan, which in the Montreux convention had been declared abrogated, was extensively disregarded.

At the end of the war broadcasting conditions in Europe were in a chaotic state and the European nations accordingly wished to establish a new convention and plan as soon as practicable.

At the world radio conferences held at Atlantic City in the summer of 1947, the European nations produced an additional protocol to the acts of the International Radio Conference. In this additional protocol directives were given for the calling of a European Regional Broadcasting Conference at Copenhagen and for the preliminary work to be done at Brussels by a committee of eight nations in preparation for the Copenhagen conference.

Under the terms of the directives, any extra-European country signatory to the Atlantic City convention or adhering thereto should have the right to be represented at the European Regional Broadcasting Conference. Such representation should be by observers who would be permitted to attend all meetings and to speak on any question which they considered affected the interests of the radio services of their countries. However, such observers would not be entitled to vote.

In view of the fact that broadcasting frequencies were being extensively used in the American occupied areas of Germany, both for German language broadcasts to the indigenous people of those areas and for English language broadcasts to the American troops, it was deemed expedient to send a United States delegation of observers both to the Brussels preparatory meetings and to the Copenhagen conference itself in order to protect American interests in Germany.

Brussels Preparatory Meetings

In accordance with the terms of the additional protocol, a preparatory committee made up of personnel from eight European nations was cre-

ated to prepare a draft frequency assignment plan for presentation to the full conference at Copenhagen. This preparatory committee subsequently became known as the Committee of Eight. The eight member nations were the United Kingdom, France, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Sweden, Switzerland, Netherlands, and Belgium, the host government.

The Committee of Eight began functioning on January 15, 1948, and continued its first session until March 20, 1948.

All European countries were requested to submit their frequency requirements in writing to the Committee. In the case of Germany the requirements were submitted through the Quadripartite Committee of Telecommunications and Posts. With respect to the needs of the United States, the Committee of Telecommunications and Posts transmitted the requirements presented to it by the military authorities of the United States in Germany. These requirements consisted of 13 frequencies which were being currently used for German language and English language broadcasting, and also a request for two additional frequencies to be used by the Voice of America.

The Quadripartite Telecommunications and Posts Committee also forwarded the requirements of the other three occupying powers at the same time. These requirements were sent to the Committee of Eight on February 10, 1948.

Three of the four powers occupying Germany were represented on the Committee of Eight and decisions were reached by each of these three powers (United Kingdom, France, and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) that the requirements submitted by their military authorities in Germany were excessive and should be reduced to a minimum.

According to directives governing the Committee of Eight, any administration of the European region had the right to send a delegation to the Committee to express the administration's views. However, when two representatives from General Clay's Office of Military Government attempted to present verbally the American requirements, they were not permitted to appear before the Committee of Eight.

Inasmuch as these two men bore credentials from the Office of Military Government rather than from the United States Government, the delegate from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the delegate from Yugoslavia stated that it would be illegal for the Committee of Eight to listen to

February 13, 1949

ACTIVITIES AND DEVELOPMENTS

representations from these two gentlemen, and that if the majority of the Committee of Eight decided to hear them anyway, the representatives from Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia would withdraw from the Committee. This of course would break up the Committee of Eight which had been created at Atlantic City, and any decisions rendered by the remaining participants could be attacked as being without legal foundation, since no provision had been made for creating a Committee of Six. Although the other six members of the Committee of Eight were willing to hear General Clay's representatives, because of the threat from the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia they denied their request for a hearing.

On May 11, 1948, the second session of the Committee of Eight was convened at Brussels. This session lasted until June 9 and in the course of its work heard the delegates of twenty-two European countries who desired to state the attitudes of their respective governments. The United States sent a full delegation to the second session of the Committee of Eight, and this delegation was also denied the privilege of appearing before the Committee and defending the United States requirements.

The Committee of Eight eventually drafted two proposals for presentation to the full European Broadcasting Conference scheduled to start in Copenhagen on June 25.

Copenhagen Conference

The Danish Government invited through diplomatic channels the following countries of the European area to send representatives to the conference: Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Turkey, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Vatican City, and Yugoslavia.

Thirty-two of these invited countries participated in the conference. Lebanon informed the Danish Government that she would not attend.

There were a number of other countries which asked to be admitted to participate in the work of the conference with the right to vote, but their petitions were denied. These countries were: Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Moldavia, Finno-Carelia, and the State of Israel.

The debate on admission of these countries was lengthy and bitter. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and satellites were determined to obtain five more votes for the Eastern bloc (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and satellites already accounted for 11 votes at the conference). The result of the voting on the admission of the three Baltic states and of Moldavia and Finno-Carelia

was 11 votes for admission and 21 votes against.

The Delegation of the United States was composed as follows:

Robert R. Burton, Chairman, International Broadcasting Division, Department of State
Richard J. Condon, Assistant Chairman, Civil Affairs Division, Department of the Army
John N. Plakias, First Secretary, United States Embassy, Paris
Charles S. Lewis, Information Control Division, Office of Military Government, Berlin
Edgar T. Martin, Communications Group, Office of Military Government, Berlin.

As is the usual custom, the head of the Delegation of the host government was acclaimed chairman of the conference. This honor fell to N. E. Holmblad, Chief of Posts and Telegraphs. The vice-chairman was Gunnar Pedersen, Chief of the Radio Section of Posts and Telegraphs of Denmark. The secretary-in-chief of the conference was William F. Studer, Counselor of the General Secretariat of the International Telecommunications Union.

The following committees were established:

Committee One. Executive Committee to examine problems connected with the timetable of the Conference and the coordination of work of the different committees.

Committee Two. Credentials Committee to examine the validity of credentials.

Committee Three. Organizing Committee to study proposals concerning the organization of the Conference and the implementation of the Frequency Plan. This committee was also entrusted with drafting the new Convention.

Committee Four. Technical Committee. This committee was given the task of defining the technical bases for the preparation of the plan, such as determining the separation in kilocycles between the frequencies assigned to broadcasting stations, power limitation, use of directional antennas, and synchronization of transmitters.

Committee Five. Frequency Allocation Committee. This committee was entrusted with the drafting of the frequency plan and the discussion of the date of entry into force of the plan.

Committee Six. Drafting Committee. This committee was entrusted with the drafting of the final documents of the conference.

The problem of languages was a particularly difficult one. At the Atlantic City Conference held in 1947, the five official languages recognized by the United Nations (English, French, Spanish, Russian, and Chinese) were adopted as official languages of the International Telecommunication Union. However, also at Atlantic City three working languages were designated (English, French, Spanish), and article 15 of the Atlantic City convention states that other languages may be used in conferences and at meetings of the permanent organs of the union, but that the delega-

tions using them must make arrangements themselves for oral translations into any one of the three working languages. Similarly, delegations may arrange for speeches to be translated orally into their own languages from one of the three working languages.

This arrangement disturbed the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics delegation, who pointed out that there was no need for using Spanish at the European Regional Broadcasting Conference since Spain was not invited to attend. The U.S.S.R. therefore insisted that Russian be considered an official working language of the conference and be given equal treatment with French and English both in the oral translations provided by the simultaneous interpreting system and in the written documents. The British Delegation stated that they were quite willing to have this done providing the U.S.S.R. would abide by the Atlantic City convention and assume the added expense for the use of the Russian language. In this stand the British received no support from the other voting members of the conference and Russian was proclaimed an official working language of the conference to be treated exactly as English and French. In the final days of the Conference, the United Kingdom delegation brought up the point of payment for the use of the Russian language and insisted that the action of the Copenhagen conference should not be taken as a precedent for any future conferences.

At the outset of the conference, the U.S.S.R. proposed that all press releases should be unanimously approved by the Conference before being released to the press. As a result of the debate which ensued, the following rule was adopted: "Plenary meetings of the Conference shall be open to the public unless otherwise decided by a majority vote. Official releases to the press about the work of the conference shall be issued only as authorized by the chairman or vice-chairman of the conference. However, the official release at the end of the conference shall require the approval of a plenary meeting."

At various times during the course of the conference, the Soviet Delegation, the Albanian Delegation, and the Yugoslavian Delegation made charges that the press was given far too much freedom in being permitted to attend the plenary sessions.

The Copenhagen conference was originally scheduled to end on August 15, 1948, however, by the first of August it became quite evident that this closing date was not in view, and accordingly, September 11, 1948, was agreed upon as the final closing date.

During the last week of the conference, plenary sessions were held at night and some of them lasted nearly all night long. The object of these night meetings was to give the Plan Drafting sub-committee an opportunity to work during the day and

to present its work to the plenary session at night. Actually, the Plan Drafting Sub-committee did not find it possible to present its complete proposal for both medium and long wave broadcasting before 8 p. m. on the night of September 11, which was to have been the final closing date.

Several of the smaller countries protested this procedure. It had been quite obvious that one or more of the major European powers had purposely prolonged the conference, and then had waited until the last night before permitting a full and complete picture of the proposed frequency assignments in Europe to be presented.

When these protests were voiced, the Soviet launched an attack on the smaller nations and claimed they would be held responsible for sabotaging the work of the entire conference if they did not accept the proposed plan.

However, it became evident that the smaller countries were not willing to sign the plan on that particular night, and the closing date of the conference was postponed for a second time in order to give most of the countries an opportunity to study the proposed plan in its entirety.

Most of the countries represented at the European Regional Broadcasting Conference intended to send their same representatives to the World High Frequency Broadcasting Conference at Mexico City starting October 22. For this reason the Copenhagen conference should close, since most of the delegations could return to their respective countries and make preparations for the forthcoming Mexico City conference. The Soviet did not intend to send its same delegation to Mexico City, and therefore sought to prolong the conference until all other delegations were ready to leave. At that point the Soviet-endorsed plan was presented, and the other nations had to accept it without much alteration, or reject it, and bear the onus of causing the failure of the Copenhagen conference.

At the meeting on September 11, the chairman of the conference requested that countries with reservations or statements submit them in writing in advance of the final plenary session rescheduled for September 14.

Twenty-eight countries (including the United States) entered statements or reservations. There was no time for them to be distributed, nor was there time to read them aloud at the final plenary session. The chairman of the conference stated that they could be seen by any participant wishing to see them before signing.

At the final plenary session a delicate problem was surmounted by the chairman, who realized that if the reservations entered by the various nations were incorporated in the body of the plan, there would be very few signatures to the plan. He therefore stated that he and the Vice Chairman had carefully looked over all the statements and had found only one which must be classed as

a "reservation". This one reservation was made on the part of Portugal and as a reservation it had to be accepted by the conference and attached to the plan. The acceptance of the reservation by the conference was contested, and the matter was finally decided by vote, so the reservation of Portugal is now accepted by all signatories to the Copenhagen plan.

All other reservations (including the one made by the United States) were arbitrarily classed as "statements" and therefore were not subject to acceptance by the conference; nor were they to be considered part of the plan.

In its statement, the United States expresses its regret that neither the Brussels committee nor the Copenhagen conference saw fit to consider seriously the United States requirements in Germany and the current situation in Germany. The assignment of one shared frequency for troop broadcasting and two shared frequencies for a single program for German language broadcasting is evidence of this fact. The United States statement concludes with the remark that the United States Government is not prepared to implement any allocation plan which envisages only one program per zone in Germany and only one shared frequency for United States troop broadcasting.

A formal press release on the work of the Copen-

hagen conference had been prepared by the chairman, and it was approved by the final plenary session.

At 2:30 a.m. on the morning of September 15 the work of the conference was officially declared closed by the chairman, the plenary session was ended, and the signatures of the delegates of 25 countries were affixed to the Copenhagen convention and plan.

The European Broadcasting Conference at Copenhagen accomplished two things. First, a new convention establishing the basic regulations for broadcasting relationships between the European nations was created and approved. Secondly, a frequency assignment plan, called the "Copenhagen Plan" for both long-wave and medium-wave broadcasting was drafted and approved.

Although the Copenhagen Plan is scheduled to go into effect on March 15, 1950, the signing of the plan by 25 nations and the entering of statements or reservations by 20 of them, coupled with the outright refusal to sign the plan on the part of 7 European countries, plus the possible lack of cooperation on the part of the 9 affected countries who were not allowed to vote—Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Finno-Carelia, Moldavia, Israel, Spain, San Marino, and the United States of America—does not augur well for the success of the plan.

South East Asia Regional Air Navigation Meeting

BY CLIFFORD P. BURTON

The South East Asia Regional Air Navigation meeting held at New Delhi, India, November 23 to December 14, 1948, under the auspices of the International Civil Aviation Organization was the ninth in the original series of ten regional meetings scheduled by ICAO to survey aviation facilities throughout the world. The final meeting of the original series will be held at London, March 22, 1949, and will cover the area embraced by the African-Indian Ocean region.

Fourteen contracting states attended the meeting, thirteen of which attended as voting members. The voting member contracting states included Afghanistan, Australia, Burma, Ceylon, China, France, India, Netherlands, Pakistan, Portugal, Siam, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Czechoslovakia and Belgium attended as contracting states but as nonvoting members of the meeting. Iran attended as a nonmember observing state. International organizations represented included the International Air Transport Association and the International Meteorological Organization. A fact-finding group convened the week prior to the regional meeting to examine and docu-

ment operational data for the convenience and use of the main meeting. The North Pacific Regional Air Navigation meeting held at Seattle, Wash., July 13-29, 1948, was the first at which the fact-finding group was utilized, and the deliberations of the fact-finding group for this meeting were patterned after the results of the Seattle conference. The organization of the meeting was identical with that employed at the North Pacific and included subcommittee I of the General Committee and Technical Committees in the fields of air-traffic control, aeronautical communications and radio aids to air navigation, aerodromes, air routes and ground aids, aeronautical meteorology, and search and rescue. In addition a special frequency planning group was established to review the results of the International Radio Administrative Conference held at Geneva, September 1-October 5, 1948, and to apply the results of that meeting to specific problems on frequencies in the South East Asia region. N. C. Ghosh, leader of the Indian Delegation, was elected Chairman of the General Committee. Mohammed Ismail, leader of the Pakistan Delegation, was elected first

vice-chairman and D. Haguénau, leader of the French Delegation, was elected second vice-chairman. The results of the meeting are quite satisfactory to the United States and it was found unnecessary to file any statements or reservations in the reports of the technical committees or the General Committee. The United States position, as approved by the Interdepartmental Air Coordinating Committee, was upheld to a high degree. A digest of the accomplishments in the technical fields is given in the brief summary that follows:¹

Flight Operations

Problems in connection with this subject were handled by the no. I subcommittee of the General Committee. The committee developed an over-all regional plan outlining the operational requirements in each technical field for the guidance of the other technical committees. The technical committees in turn developed detailed recommendations based on the over-all regional plan. A standard altimeter setting of 29.92 inches of mercury was recommended for vertical separation of aircraft, excluding the areas along routes approximately one hundred miles from the major terminals. In these latter areas QNH value for altimeter settings will be utilized for both terrain clearance and altitude separation. Dimensional units were not discussed at this meeting since annex 5 to the convention establishes the units to be used, with each State to indicate to ICAO the particular table or tables of the annex which it will apply to its national and international practices. A highly detailed plan for the handling of international NOTAMS was developed at this meeting.

Aerodromes, Air Routes, and Ground Aids

The committee agreed on the visual aid requirements for air routes and for aerodromes and on the number, location, and necessary technical characteristics of aerodromes to serve the air traffic requirements of the region. In the case of strength characteristics those recommended are adequate to support any aircraft any operator proposes to operate in the region. While they may be somewhat below those requested by the United States they are the maxima that could be technically justified in debate.

Air-Traffic Control

The committee agreed to establish flight information regions to cover all international routes and to establish aerodrome and approach control at all aerodromes regularly used by international air traffic. The states concerned agreed to establish control areas around international aerodromes where the volume of operations warranted and to establish control zones at all aerodromes where aerodrome control is provided. Supplementary procedures for air-traffic control were developed similar to those developed for the North

and South Pacific regions. The committee also decided that English should be used throughout the region for air-traffic control purposes except in French Indochina. In this area English was specified as the secondary language.

Aeronautical Telecommunications and Radio Aids to Air Navigation

The committee developed plans for proposed point-to-point aeronautical communications circuits, aeronautical air-ground circuits and adequate aeronautical radio navigational aids to meet the needs of the other technical services. In addition recommendations were included which indicated the desirability of establishing the U.S. sponsored VHF Omni range with DME at 14 locations within the region.

Aeronautical Meteorology

The committee recommended a network of 337 six-hourly surface stations reporting four times a day and a network of 108 three-hourly surface stations reporting eight times a day. This involved the complete establishment of six new stations and the partial establishment of 90 other stations. The committee also recommended a network of 181 upper-wind stations and a network of 56 radiosonde stations reporting twice daily. About 56 additional hourly stations were recommended to take observations on an "as required" basis for operations.

Search and Rescue

The committee followed the pattern of previous regional meetings in this technical field and reviewed and tabulated the search and rescue facilities provided in the region and included therewith recommendations for certain additional facilities to meet the minimum requirements for the region.

Frequency Planning Group

The committee made a detailed study of the final report of the International Administrative Aeronautical Radio Conference in Geneva in 1948 and used it as a basis upon which to draft a frequency allotment plan for the South East Asia region. In the course of its deliberations the Frequency Planning Group developed formulas which may be found extremely useful in other regions in the proposed allotment of frequencies for the aeronautical services. A similar frequency planning group will be utilized at the forthcoming African-Indian Ocean meeting to be convened in London, March 22, 1949. The group will also take into consideration the Middle East frequency problem.

¹ Specific details concerning the recommendations of the seven committees, in the order named, may be found in Doc. SE. 306, GC Sub-I/SE. 100; Doc. SE. 301, AGA SE/100; Doc. SE. 302, ATC SE/100; Doc. SE. 303, COM SE/100; Doc. SE. 304, MET SE/100; Doc. SE. 305, SAR SE/100; Doc. SE. 303, COM SE/100.

THE RECORD OF THE WEEK

Comments on Premier Stalin's Answers to Questions Submitted by Kingsbury Smith

REMARKS BY SECRETARY ACHESON¹

I suppose except for the preservation of our nation and of our liberties, there is no matter more fundamental to the American people than the preservation of peace. I say this because it is a matter not only fundamental but also sacred in America, and neither our people nor any of our representatives would play international politics with a matter of this importance. The hopes of hundreds of millions of people throughout the world are pinned on the preservation of peace. No man of conscience would tamper with those hopes or use the raising or the lowering of them as a pawn in any maneuver.

Now, with those observations, I wish to talk about these questions and answers quite candidly but quite realistically.²

The first one of them, in the first group, reads as follows:

"Would the Government of the U.S.S.R. be prepared to consider the issuance of a joint declaration with the Government of the United States of America asserting that the respective governments have no intention of resorting to war against one another?"

The answer is that "the Soviet Government would be prepared to consider the issuance of such a declaration."

Now, I confess that I find this answer puzzling. Both the Soviet Union and the United States and all the other members of the United Nations are pledged by the most solemn treaty commitments not to engage in war against one another. I should like to refresh your memory.

Paragraphs three and four of article II of the United Nations Charter provide:

All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or

¹Transcription of extemporaneous remarks made at the Secretary's press conference on Feb. 2, 1949, and released on the same date.

²The following questions commented on were sent on Jan. 27, 1949, to Premier Stalin by Kingsbury Smith, European General Manager of the International News Service. Mr. Stalin's answers were given on Jan. 30, 1949.

in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.

The President of the United States in his inaugural address stated that it was the position of his administration and of the people of the United States to give unfaltering support to the United Nations. He did not say that he was prepared to consider making that statement. He made it. So as I say, this answer is a puzzling one. So far as commitment is concerned, so far as the most solemnly pledged word is concerned, I had thought that we had long passed the point at which this answer seems to stick.

Question no. 2: "Would the Government of the U.S.S.R. be prepared to join with the Government of the United States of America in measures designed to implement this pact of peace such as gradual disarmaments?"

The answer is: "Naturally the Government of the U.S.S.R. would cooperate with the Government of the United States of America in the carrying out of measures designed to implement this pact of peace and leading to gradual disarmament."

Now, "naturally" means, "in the nature of things" and the nature of things in the past three years since the end of hostilities has not been such as to encourage the expectation of the cooperation which is indicated in this answer. The members of the United Nations have considered since the first draft of the Charter that the hope of disarmament required not only the confidence and assurance which would come from peace settlements, which would be enduring because they would be just, but also from the carrying out of the whole system for the preservation of international peace which is contemplated in the United Nations Charter. Indeed, the very structure of the Charter is based upon these assumptions. The United States so far from hanging back on any even technical application of this assumption led the way by a demobilization after the last war which was not gradual but was precipitant. This country disbanded the greatest assemblage of armed force which had ever been put together in the world before. Not only is this true but this Government, together with all the other governments represented upon the Security Council, with the unhappy exception of

Department of State Bulletin

the Soviet Union, did its best to implement those paragraphs and articles of the Charter which, first of all, were designed for the peaceful settlement of disputes, and secondly, for the provision of an international armed force which would give authority to the United Nations.

The use of the veto has frustrated the first effort. Obstruction of the U.S.S.R. in the military committees has frustrated the second effort. The United States went still further.

In the Atomic Energy Commission of the United Nations, it led the way in an attempt to put under international control the most destructive weapon and the most destructive force which man has yet devised. Here again these efforts of many nations were frustrated by Soviet action—so patently frustrated that the Commission was forced to report to the General Assembly that it was unable to carry out its task. In the debate which followed in the General Assembly, the Soviet Delegation made it unmistakably clear that it would not participate in any arrangements which would permit an effective international control of atomic energy.

Now, I mention these points not to score in a debate in which I have no interest but to point out that in the nature of things, the other nations have not received and have little reason to expect the cooperation which is indicated in that answer. This is certainly true if the present may be regarded as the outcome of the past.

Now I should like to take up out of order the fourth question because it relates to the first two.

The fourth question is: "Would your Excellency be prepared to confer with President Truman at a mutually suitable place to discuss the possibility of concluding such a pact of peace?"

The answer is: "I have already stated before that there is no objection to a meeting." Now you will notice that the purpose of the meeting has to do with the arrangements of which I have already spoken, that is, considering issuing a declaration regarding a matter which is already the subject of solemn treaty commitment. The White House spokesman reminded you, in answer to questions, of the fact that President Truman has on numerous occasions stated that he would be pleased to have Premier Stalin visit the United States and visit the President in Washington.

Now in this connection I am sure it is clear to you, and if it is not clear to you I should like to make it clear now, that the Government of the United States would not discuss with any nation any matter which was of direct interest to other nations without the participation of the representatives of those other nations. This is not a new or startling doctrine. There have been many statements of it. I have here one made by General Marshall on May 12 of last year when questioned about the confidential interview between Ambassador Smith and Foreign Minister Molotov.

There are two or three sentences which bear on this point. Secretary Marshall said:

"General Smith did not ask for any general discussion or negotiation. We have had a long and bitter experience with such efforts. This Government had no intention of entering into bilateral negotiations with the Soviet Government on matters relating to the interests of other governments. The discussion of any proposals in regard to outstanding issues which the Soviet Government may have in mind must, as a matter of course, be conducted in the body charged with responsibility for these questions."

Now coming back to the discussion about this meeting, this morning we have still a further development. There has been a new question and answer. We gather from that exchange that Premier Stalin is unhappily prevented by the condition of his health from coming to Washington because he cannot travel either by sea or air. He thus seems to be effectively grounded. The implication of this answer perhaps is that the President of the United States for the fourth time should travel half way around the world to meet Premier Stalin and on this occasion to do so for the purpose of talking with him on a matter so tenuous that it defies specific statement. I think that concludes the comment on that question and answer.

Now the third question and answer, which I will deal with last, is as follows: Question: "If the Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and France agreed to postpone establishment of a separate western German state pending a meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers to consider the German problem as a whole, would the Government of the U.S.S.R. be prepared to remove the restrictions which Soviet authorities have imposed on communications between Berlin and the western zones of Germany?"

Answer: "Provided the United States of America, Great Britain and France observe the conditions set forth in the third question, the Soviet Government sees no obstacles to lifting the transport restrictions on the understanding, however, that transport and trade restrictions introduced by the three powers should be lifted simultaneously."

Now this question and answer is the only one of the four which relates to an issue between the Soviet Government and the Western powers. Therefore, it is the most interesting exchange of the four. I might review very briefly for you this situation out of which it comes.

For more than six months now the protests of the three Western powers against the illegal blockade of Berlin have been the subject of the most earnest discussion. There were discussions in Moscow between the ambassadors and the Soviet authorities. The discussions were then transferred

to the military governors in Berlin. Both groups of discussions failed. The matter was then transferred to the Security Council in Paris. There the Security Council proposed a solution to this difficulty, a solution which got 9 of the 11 votes on the Security Council but failed because of the Soviet veto. This matter is still on the agenda of the Security Council.

During all of this time the reasons which were given by the Soviet Government were first of all that there were technical difficulties which interrupted transport. Then the reason was given that the blockade was necessary to protect the economy of the Soviet zone against the results of a monetary reform in the Western zone.

Now it is true that the question of the postponement of the Western German government did arise in the Moscow discussions, but it is of even greater importance, that having arisen it was abandoned by the Soviet Union as a condition to lifting the blockade for the reasons which are so fully set forth in the United States White Paper on that subject.

Last summer when these discussions were going on, the Western German government had not been formed. Its formation was not imminent. In the months which have passed it has still not been formed, and yet during all of this period the blockade has continued. The preparatory work for the formation of this Western German government has continued to go forward and is going forward as necessary work for the accomplishment of the responsibilities of the three Western powers.

The three Western powers have stressed, repeated again and again to the Soviet Union, that their agreements in regard to Western Germany do not in any sense preclude agreement on Germany as a whole. In fact, they have pointed out that this work facilitates agreement upon Germany as a whole and they have, as I have stated, stressed again and again that what they have in mind and what they are doing is purely provisional pending such agreement on Germany as a whole. During all of these months the three Western powers have tried patiently and persistently to solve the difficulties which have been put forward by the Soviet Government as the reasons for the blockade.

As to the second point in this answer made by Premier Stalin—that he would expect that if Soviet restrictions were lifted the Western restrictions would be lifted—that point has been made clear from the start. The Western governments have always stated that if the Soviet Government permits normal communications with and within Berlin their counter measures will, of course, be lifted.

There are many ways in which a serious proposal by the Soviet Government to restore normal interzonal communications and communications with and within Berlin could be made. All channels are open for any suggestions to that end. The United States, together with the other Western occupying powers, would, of course, consider carefully any proposal made to solve the Berlin problem consistent with their rights, their duties, their obligations as occupying powers.

As I say, all of the normal channels are open. I hope you will not take it amiss if I point out that if I on my part were seeking to give assurance of seriousness of purpose I would choose some other channel than the channel of a press interview.

May I end this statement as I began it, by stating that the interest of the United States and of all the hundreds of millions of people throughout the world in peace is so fundamental that the matter of peace cannot be tampered with and cannot be used as an instrument in any international political maneuver. It will not be so used by the United States.

Uruguayan Musician To Study in U.S.

Miss Nilda Muller, Director of the University of Montevideo Chorus and Professor of Musical Education for Secondary Schools in that country, has arrived in the United States to spend six months in study and observation of choral activities in universities of this country. Her visit is sponsored by the University of Montevideo and supplemented by a grant-in-aid from the Department of State. The Pan American Union is co-operating in planning her program and itinerary. During the month of February Miss Muller will visit Fisk, Northwestern, and Wayne Universities, the University of Michigan, Oberlin College, and the Eastman School of Music at the University of Rochester.

Chilean Zoologist Visits in U.S.

Dr. Guillermo Mann, professor of zoology at the University of Chile, has arrived in Washington to confer with officials of the Smithsonian Institution and to study various museums in the United States. His visit has been arranged under the travel-grant program of the Department of State in cooperation with the Smithsonian Institution. Dr. Mann will spend a month in Washington before proceeding to other places in the United States for study. These include museums in Chicago, New York, and Woods Hole, Massachusetts.

Department of State Bulletin

Military Security Board for Western Zones of Germany¹

ESTABLISHMENT BY U.S., U.K., AND FRANCE

The Military Security Board is now created.

This new organization, directly subordinate to the united Commanders-in-Chief of the Western Zones, was, in the beginning of 1948 the subject of explicit stipulations in the London Agreement.²

Its task is that of ensuring that the development of general activity in Germany, the purpose of which is to repair her damages, and enable her to participate in international cooperation, is not deflected from its peaceful aims, by risking the re-birth of a war potential.

Assuming responsibility for a certain number of the activities of the Control Council, its role is twofold:

It must, first of all, harmonize and complete the legislative and regulatory work begun in the field of security. For this purpose it will base its review on previously established quadripartite laws and directives.

It will then have to ensure the regular implementation of laws and regulations thus published, by means of inspections conducted in accordance with certain rules. The inspectors of the Board will be empowered to make inspections of plants and establishments. If the Board deems advis-

able, they may make these inspections without giving prior notice to the Management of the plant.

In the field of personnel it will prevent the resurgence of military organizations and the militaristic spirit; in the field of industry, it will ensure the implementation of such prohibitive and restrictive measures within certain industries as may be agreed upon by the Occupying Powers for security reasons; in the field of scientific research, it will make sure that no activity is directed towards war objectives.

The general structure of the Military Security Board corresponds to this partition of duties and includes, in addition to the directing bodies (the Commission and the permanent Committee of Deputies) three specialized Divisions: Military, Industrial and Scientific Research, to which inspection groups are attached for making investigations in the field.

This new organization, by continuing the quadripartite effort, interrupted previously, is in no way designed to restrict unnecessarily the peaceful economic and scientific development of Germany, but constitutes an essential safeguard for all the nations concerned.

DIRECTIVE ON ORGANIZATION

Part I—Terms of Reference

1. In accordance with the terms of the London Agreement, a Military Security Board for the Western Zones of Germany will be set up by the Military Governors in order to ensure the maintenance of disarmament and demilitarization in the interests of security.

2. The Board's responsibilities will cover the whole field of disarmament and demilitarization, taking into consideration the laws and directives which have been agreed already on a quadripartite basis. In particular the Board will advise the Military Governors on the maintenance and enforcement of disarmament and demilitarization restrictions. It will carry out the appropriate inspections and will recommend to the Military Governors measures necessary to:

(a) prevent the revival of military or paramilitary organizations and of the militaristic spirit;

(b) ensure that there shall be no manufacture or import of any arms, war materials or any other

materials or equipment which are or may be prohibited;

(c) prevent the infringement by Germans of restrictions in respect of certain industries;

(d) ensure that any military buildings, structures, laboratories, and all shipyards, or factories capable of producing armaments which may be retained are used for peaceful purposes only;

(e) ensure that scientific research is not directed to warlike ends;

(f) ensure that in connection with the construction and operation of merchant shipping and the operation of civil airlines, no war potential is created.

3. In carrying out its task, the Board will:

(a) Study the existing laws and directives, both quadripartite and zonal, and make recommendations if they require additions or amendments, and

¹ Released to the press for the U.S., U.K., and France by OMGUS, Public Information Office in Berlin on Jan. 17, 1949.

² BULLETIN of Jan. 9, 1949, p. 43.

where advisable produce uniformity throughout the three zones;

(b) Recommend to the Military Governors any laws or regulations to be enacted which may be necessary for the completion of disarmament, or for the prohibition or limitation of specified military, industrial, scientific research or other activities;

(c) Ensure the implementation of the regulations by inspection and ensure that the statistics necessary for the Board are maintained by Germans. The reports of inspections will be presented to the Military Governors, together with the observations of the Board;

(d) Advise the Military Governors on revisions, which may be necessary from time to time, of the prohibitions of and limitations on capacity or production imposed upon German industry;

(e) Collect, centralize and keep up to date full documentation on the elements which might reconstitute a war potential in the military, industrial and scientific fields.

Part II—Constitution and Functioning

4. *The Military Security Board will be made up of the following elements:*

- (a) A Commission
- (b) A Committee of Deputies
- (c) A Secretariat
- (d) Three Divisions: Military, Industrial and Scientific Research
- (e) Inspection Groups.

5. *Security in the Ruhr*

The Board will establish such machinery and liaison for co-operation with the International Authority for the Ruhr as may be found necessary.

6. *The Commission*

(a) The Commission will consist of three Officers, of general or equivalent rank, or their deputies, appointed by and representing the respective Military Governors.

(b) In principle, it will meet once a month, or as necessary, for the ordinary sessions, under the chairmanship of one of the members in rotation, to examine the work undertaken by the Board; to prepare and present its recommendations to the Military Governors; to decide on any special missions of inspection to be carried out in the zones; to take all necessary measures to facilitate the functioning of the Board and all its implementing services.

(c) Each member of the Commission may be assisted at the meetings by his Deputy, a Chief, Secretary, or any other experts that he may deem necessary, either from the Board or from outside the Board.

(d) The Commission will hold extraordinary meetings at the request of one of its members.

(e) The majority rule will govern the decisions

of the Commission, provided that the minority member may refer the question to the Military Governors, this to have a suspensory effect until the decision has been rendered.

7. *Committee of Deputies*

The Deputies to the Commission will form a permanent Committee at the headquarters of the Board in order to direct its business. In particular, they will co-ordinate the work of the Divisions and provide a chairman (of the nationality of the chairman of the Commission for the month) at joint meetings of two or more Divisions.

8. *Secretariat*

(a) The Secretariat will be composed of three Chief Secretaries, one for each national element.

The Duty Secretaryship will be rotated among the Chief Secretaries so that the nationality of the Duty Secretary will correspond to that of the chairman of the Commission. A permanent integrated staff of secretaries, clerks, interpreters and other personnel will be provided as necessary, each power contributing a reasonably proportionate share of the personnel required.

(b) The Secretariat will be in charge of the administrative functioning of the Board, and will be responsible for ensuring liaison between the elements of the Board and outside agencies, for administrative arrangements for all meetings; for the performance of secretarial functions at all meetings of any element of the Board; for the drawing up of minutes and reports; for the handling of correspondence; for arranging for and notifying the proper authorities of scheduled inspections; for distributing documents and keeping of archives.

(c) The Secretariat will have a tripartite integrated information section which will be responsible for the centralization and keeping up-to-date of the information collected by the Board.

9. *Divisions*

(a) There will be three Divisions:

Military, Industrial and Scientific Research.

Within each Division, each power (U.S., U.K. and French) will establish and maintain its national element. These Divisions will operate on a coordinated basis as indicated in the organizational chart attached. While the internal organization of the national elements need not be identical, they should in general parallel each other in their functions and capabilities.

(b) Any specialist sections or working parties deemed necessary for the study of particular problems may be established within the Divisions. Such sections or parties may be integrated, all three Powers supplying members without obligation to maintain equality either in qualifications or numbers.

(c) Within the scope of the Terms of Reference, each Division, or any national element thereof, will be responsible, each in its own sphere or as

specified by the Commission for the preparation of any necessary regulating measures and recommendations for the implementation and control thereof, which are to be submitted to the Commission. Recommendations of national elements shall be tripartitely considered and resolved, insofar as is possible, within the Divisions before being presented to the Commission.

(d) Divisional meetings will take place at the headquarters of the Board. Chairmanship will be rotated among the chiefs of the national elements thereof, so that the nationality of the Division chairmen will correspond to that of the Chairman of the Commission. The Chiefs of the national elements may be assisted by any members of their elements whom they deem necessary, or by experts temporarily attached for duty to that element or from outside.

(e) Resolution of matters of joint interest to two or more Divisions shall normally be accomplished through the medium of informal lateral coordination; however, joint divisional meetings may be arranged by the Committee of Deputies upon the request of any national element.

(f) During the period when existing organizations responsible for the control of industry and of scientific research are maintained in their present form, certain functions of the Board may, with the agreement of each Military Governor, be performed by personnel regularly assigned to full-time duty with the Board, or temporarily attached for such duty. As these organizations of each representative Military Government, whose work is associated with that of the Board, phase out, the proper divisions of the Board will be expanded to assume the necessary controls to prevent the resurgence of German military, industrial, or scientific war potential.

10. *Inspection Groups*

(a) The Divisions will organize, instruct and dispatch inspectors and/or integrated tripartite inspection groups formed from personnel assigned or attached to the Board as often as necessary in

order to verify in the three Zones the conditions of execution of the measures ordered by the Military Governors. The Commission may order any special inspections it deems necessary.

(b) Administrative arrangements for these inspections will be made by the Secretariat.

(c) Inspection groups shall have free access at any time to inspect without prior notice for the purposes set forth in paragraph 2 hereof, any place, installation or activity, except that the local Military Government shall be given reasonable advance notice of such intended visits.

11. The creation of the Board implies that disarmament and demilitarization are matters of tripartite responsibility. Until the system of control at Land levels is changed, and as long as unilateral control continues in the Land, the Regional Commissioner (or his equivalent) in each Land will act as the agent of the Military Governors for disarmament and demilitarization. For this purpose he will report to the Military Governors through the Board and will receive his instructions through the same channel. He will provide such information as may be requested and will be responsible for the continuous observation of the execution of prescribed security measures. He will give full facilities for visits by the inspection groups referred to in paragraph 10 above. If he is succeeded by a Tripartite Control Commission, his function will be transferred to that commission. When and if Military Government is no longer adequately represented at Land level, the Board will establish such tripartite agencies as it deems necessary to ensure control in the Lands.

12. *Nomination of Members of the Board*

The members of the Board and experts will be appointed by the respective Military Governors, and accredited to the Board by the corresponding member of the Commission.

13. *Rules of Procedure*

The Committee of Deputies will establish routine and procedure for the Board.

U.S. Refuses Extradition of Hungarian Refugees From U.S. Zone in Germany

[Released to the press February 2]

Following is the textual substance of an exchange of notes between the Hungarian Ministry for Foreign Affairs and the American Legation in Budapest under date of January 9 and January 31, 1949, respectively, with regard to the refugee crew members of a Hungarian-Soviet Airline plane which landed near Munich in the United States zone of occupation in Germany on January 4:

February 6, 1949

Note from Hungarian Ministry for Foreign Affairs

The Hungarian Minister for Foreign Affairs has the honor to call the attention of the Legation to the fact, that by conducting the aeroplane entrusted to them to a destination other than scheduled, the crew of the aeroplane are conclusively suspected to have committed the crime of

(Continued on page 206)

Growth of the Organization of American States

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY ACHESON¹

The treaty-document that is here submitted for the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification is the proposed legal constitution of the regional inter-American organization. The question that it raises, however, is hardly whether there shall be such an organization. The organization has already proved its value over some 60 years of existence, during which the United States has continuously taken an active part in its development. The constitutional instrument before you represents simply a culmination of this long and successful process. It signifies that our organized inter-American community of good neighbors has been readjusted to serve more adequately the needs of its member states in the contemporary world.

Two factors have combined to make it advisable that our inter-American system now be endowed with a single written charter. The first is the growth in its size, in the scope of its activities, and in its importance to all the American republics during recent years. The second is the establishment of the United Nations, which has given it a new context, giving it the character of a regional agency of the world system in addition to its long-established role as a distinct association of American states.

There are great advantages, where time allows, to building an organization gradually, adding to its structure piece by piece in the light of experience with its operation. The first of the Pan American Conferences, which convened in Washington at the call of the United States in 1889, established the first piece of the inter-American organization, a small permanent office that grew over the years into the present Pan American Union. New pieces were added by successive conferences, which generally met every five years. In the 1930's, when the rise of aggressive dictatorships in Europe and Asia menaced the entire world, the American states undertook a relatively rapid development of their organization to strengthen their common security. The war and the events leading up to it gave impetus to the expansion, the elaboration, and the strengthening of that organization. During those years it grew so rapidly that it threatened, so to speak, to outgrow its old clothes.

With the conclusion of the war, therefore, the American states took stock of all the organiza-

tional machinery that had developed within their system, and decided that a general consolidation and codification was called for. At the Mexico City conference in 1945, they proceeded to lay down the lines for such a reorganization. The Governing Board of the Pan American Union was charged with the main preparatory work, and the final decisions emerged from the Bogotá conference of 1948 in the form of the present charter that is now presented for your consideration.

The Mexico City conference took place shortly after the Dumbarton Oaks conversations when the main outlines of the new United Nations structure had already emerged. The conferees at Mexico City were alive to the necessity of developing a constructive relationship between the inter-American system and the United Nations Organization, when it should be set up, so that each would constitute an element of strength for the other. This consideration, too, argued the necessity of giving our regional system a more orderly and clearly defined form.

The United Nations had been established at San Francisco, of course, by the time the American states got down to the work of drafting an inter-American charter. Written into the San Francisco Charter, with the strong support of the American states, was chapter VIII on regional arrangements, and article 51 recognizing the inherent right of individual and collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs. The San Francisco Charter has, in turn, exerted a significant influence in shaping the new forms of our hemisphere system as embodied in this Bogotá charter.

Rather than burden this committee with a lengthy oral statement analyzing the provisions of the Bogotá charter in detail, I propose to recommend to your attention the pertinent chapter of the report of the United States Delegation to the Bogotá conference, and to confine myself, here, to general outlines and the points of principal significance.

As the broad purpose of the United Nations is to achieve world peace and security and to promote human welfare, so the broad purpose of the Organization of American States, explicitly set forth in chapter I of this charter, is to strengthen the peace and security of the continent and to further the economic, social, and cultural progress of the Americas.

The organizational machinery established for these purposes consists principally of three sorts

¹ Given upon the occasion of referral of the charter of the Organization of American States to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification on Feb. 2, 1949, and released to the press on the same date. See S. Exec. A, 81st Cong., 1st sess.

of institutions: (1) the conferences; (2) the Council of the Organization and the Pan American Union; and (3) the specialized organizations.

The conferences themselves are of three kinds:

The Inter-American Conference, which is a new name for the International Conference of American States that has met more or less regularly, generally at five-year intervals, since 1889. This is "the supreme organ of the Organization".

The meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs does not meet at fixed intervals, but only when problems of an urgent nature require a meeting of top-level representatives. The three meetings of Foreign Ministers held during the past war have shown what an effective device this is for dealing with emergencies. Its agenda is limited, it can meet quickly, and it can act decisively. This conference or "meeting" also serves as the "Organ of Consultation", under the Rio treaty of reciprocal assistance with which you gentlemen are familiar. As such it has the assistance of an Advisory Defense Committee, which meets only in connection with meetings of the Organ of Consultation and is composed of the highest military authorities of the participating states.

The third category consists of specialized conferences, like conferences on agriculture or public health, most of which are sponsored by specialized organizations. Their purpose is "to deal with special technical matters or to develop specific aspects of inter-American cooperation".

The second group of agencies within the general Organization of American States is represented by the Council of the Organization and the Pan American Union. The Council replaces the former Governing Board of the Pan American Union. However, its scope has been increased under the present charter to embrace activities of the entire Organization, with specified political, advisory, and coordinating functions. It is composed of one representative from each member state and is established permanently in Washington. Under the reciprocal defense treaty of Rio de Janeiro, it is the provisional Organ of Consultation pending the convening of the Foreign Ministers when the treaty is invoked. Tied in with this Council are three specialized councils on economic and social affairs on juridical matters, and on cultural matters respectively.

The Pan American Union, which has been undergoing an internal reorganization and strengthening, is the "general secretariat" of the Organization and a focal point for the continuing conduct of the Organization's varied business in the economic and social, the juridical, and the cultural fields.

The specialized organizations constitute the third and final group within the general Organization. They are autonomous technical agencies

"having specific functions with respect to technical matters of common interest to the American states". The Pan American Sanitary Bureau and the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences are examples.

That, in broad outline, is the Organization of American States, as set forth in this charter.

I have mentioned that the Organization of American States, under this charter, has a dual capacity: (1) as an independent regional association of states; and (2) as a regional arrangement under the United Nations, all the American states being also members of the United Nations. In its first capacity, its actions are and must be consistent with the United Nations Charter. In the second capacity, its purpose is to strengthen and support the larger efforts of the United Nations, serving, particularly in the security and pacific settlement fields, as agent for the latter. The relationship with the United Nations in the field of security is defined in various articles of the Rio treaty of reciprocal assistance. Both the Rio treaty and the Bogotá charter contain articles stating that none of their provisions shall be construed as impairing the rights and obligations of the states under the United Nations Charter.

The Bogotá charter contains additional directives to the inter-American agencies for collaboration with the United Nations. One of the duties of the Council of the Organization is to promote and facilitate such collaboration. Its three technical councils are specifically enjoined to establish, in agreement with the Council, "cooperative relations with the corresponding organs of the United Nations". Finally, the dual character of the Organization is specifically reflected in the provision (art. 100) that the specialized agencies, "In concluding agreement with international agencies of a world-wide character, . . . shall preserve their identity and their status as integral parts of the Organization of American States, even when they perform regional functions of international agencies."

By and of itself, this organizational structure would be merely so much inert machinery. What gives it purpose and effectiveness, what animates it, is a set of aspirations and principles that the American states have in common. These aspirations and principles are familiar to us. They are essentially the aspirations and principles of democratic and peace-loving peoples throughout the world, the aspirations to strengthen peace, security, justice, social progress, and economic well-being, the principles based on respect for the rights of others. They are, specifically, the traditional aspirations and principles of the American states and of the international system through which they take common action for their achievement.

These purposes and principles are also written into the Bogotá charter. I may cite as character-

istic of them, references to the juridical equality of states, to respect for international law and observance of treaties, to nonintervention in the affairs of individual countries, and to the importance of democracy to the aims of the American states. Certain of these principles are expressed in the form of rights and duties of states, the texts of which are drawn largely from previous inter-American agreements. The charter moreover stresses the necessity for peaceful settlement of inter-American disputes and incorporates the fundamental obligations of the treaty of Rio de Janeiro regarding solidarity in the face of threats or acts of aggression.

This completes my very general outline of what the Bogotá charter is and what it contains. Let me add just this. It is not all-embracing, by any means, with respect to the detailed procedures of the organized relations among the twenty-one American states. The main security provisions, for example, are to be found in the Rio treaty of

reciprocal assistance, which tied into the Bogotá charter by reference. This applies, as well, to other matters such as the pacific settlement of disputes and economic cooperation, which are also the subject of other formal inter-American agreements.

This Bogotá charter is, however, the central constitutional document, the equivalent for our regional organization of the San Francisco Charter for the United Nations. It defines the organization as a whole, establishes the framework within which it can continue to grow and to serve, ever more effectively, the common purposes, not only of the inter-American community, but of the United Nations as well. It is the product of more than half a century of evolution during which the organization has increasingly demonstrated its value to the member countries. I commend it wholeheartedly to this Committee's favorable consideration.

U.S.-Canadian Agreement on Emergency Aircraft

NEGOTIATIONS TO EXPEDITE INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY CROSSING

[Released to the press February 3]

It was announced simultaneously on February 3 in Ottawa and Washington that, with a view to expediting the movement across the international boundary of aircraft and crew members engaged in emergency air search and rescue operations, the United States and Canadian Governments had agreed in an exchange of notes to give special customs and immigration clearance to such planes and crew members of either country when entering the other's territory.

As a result of the new arrangements, it no longer will be necessary for crews of aircraft involved in air search and rescue operation to make their own arrangements individually with the Customs and Immigration authorities of the country which they are entering. Instead, completion of these formalities, by telephone or telegraph now has become the responsibility of the Search and Rescue organization dispatching the aircraft and crews.

Two of the basic requirements for the successful completion of any Search and Rescue mission are cooperation and coordination.

One of the finest examples of complete cooperation and coordination of United States, Canadian, and Newfoundland military and civil forces engaged in Search and Rescue was the location and ultimate rescue of the survivors of the Belgian Sabena Airliner crash in September, 1946.

Coordination of Search and Rescue matters among the several agencies in the United States is vested in the Search and Rescue Subcommittee of the Air Coordinating Committee.

United States Federal agencies which have facilities or can perform services useful for the performance of search and rescue missions include the Air Force, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Coast Guard, Federal Communications Commission, and the Navy. During search and rescue these agencies are not limited to equipment or facilities normally employed but may provide such resources as are necessary to complete the mission.

United States Rescue Coordination Centers have been located at strategic points within the United States so as to insure the proper and expeditious utilization of communications, aircraft, ships, vehicles, and equipment for search and rescue in any particular area.

Search and rescue organizations are constantly alert to the need for improvisation and new methods for the better accomplishment of their duties. Rescue teams composed of doctors and medical technicians, trained as parachutists, frequently are the only means of prompt medical attention to the injured stranded in inaccessible places. Partially disassembled helicopters are loaded in transport planes and flown great distances in the minimum amount of time to effect rescues. In places where even a helicopter cannot land a rescue hoist has been devised where the survivors may be picked up from land or water. Arctic dog teams, amphibious vehicles, electronic devices for survival, etc., all have been dramatically used in successful rescue.

The agreement which has been reached to facilitate the crossing of the international boundary is tangible evidence of the friendship existing between the United States and Canada. The

humanitarian aspects of the mutual assistance envisioned by search and rescue might well be a blueprint of all nations in fostering the "Good Neighbor" philosophy.

EXCHANGE OF NOTES

The Ambassador of Canada to the Secretary of State

WASHINGTON, January 24, 1949

SIR, I have the honour to refer to the discussions that have taken place in the Permanent Joint Board on Defence, with regard to the necessity of ensuring adequate cooperation between our two Governments in Air Search and Rescue operations along our common boundary.

2. As a result of the conclusions reached in the course of these discussions, my Government wishes to propose:

(1) That, in future, public aircraft of Canada or the United States which are engaged in emergency Air Search and Rescue operations, be permitted to enter or leave either country without being subject to the immigration or customs formalities normally required by the Government of either country, provided that the Rescue Coordination Centre involved in the search or rescue, either directly or through some person delegated by it, assumes the responsibility of informing by telephone or telegraph:

(a) The immigration office at the port of entry nearest to the territory over which any search or rescue is to be instituted, of the intended operation, furnishing it with details concerning the purpose of the flight; the identification markings of each aircraft; and the number of persons comprising the crew of each aircraft.

(b) The customs office nearest to the territory over which any search or rescue is to be instituted, of the intended operation, giving details concerning the territory to be searched; the possible duration of the stay of the aircraft; the identification markings of each aircraft; and the number of persons comprising the crew of each aircraft.

(2) That, should a landing be made by public aircraft of any one country in the territory of the other in the course of such emergency search or rescue, an oral or telephonic report shall be made to the nearest Collector of Customs so that he may assist, in any way possible, in connection with any special importation required in the search or rescue operations. This report may be made by the Rescue Coordination Centre organizing the operation, or by the pilots concerned, whichever would best serve the interests of the rescue operations involved.

(3) That, should any merchandise carried, in

February 6, 1949

the aircraft in question, from one country to the other in the course of such search or rescue, remain in the latter country on conclusion of an operation, such merchandise will be subject to the customs treatment normally accorded in that country to imported merchandise.

3. The term "public aircraft," as used in this Note, refers to aircraft of the Canadian and United States Governments and such other aircraft of United States and Canadian registry as may be brought under the control of a Rescue Coordination Centre in either country for the purposes of an emergency search or rescue operation.

4. If your Government concurs in the foregoing proposals, it is the desire of my Government that this Note, together with your reply agreeing thereto, constitute an agreement between our two Governments that is to be effective from the date of your reply and to remain in force until sixty days after either party to the agreement has signified to the other a desire to terminate it.

Accept [etc.]

H. H. WRONG

Ambassador to the United States

The Secretary of State to the Canadian Ambassador

January 31, 1949

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note No. 35 of January 24, 1949, referring to the discussions that have taken place in the Permanent Joint Board on Defense with regard to the necessity of ensuring adequate cooperation between our two Governments in Air Search and Rescue operations along our common boundary, and to this end proposing:

2. As a result of the conclusions reached in the course of these discussions, my Government wishes to propose: [Here follow paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 as printed in the Canadian note above.]

In reply I have the honor to inform Your Excellency that the Government of the United States concurs in the foregoing proposals and agrees that Your Excellency's note and this reply shall be regarded as constituting an agreement between our two Governments that is to be effective from this date and shall remain in force until sixty days after either party to the agreement has signified to the other a desire to terminate it.

Accept [etc.]

JAMES E. WEBB

Under Secretary of State

THE CONGRESS

Special Contribution by the United States to the United Nations for Relief of Palestine Refugees¹

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE CONGRESS

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed letter from the Acting Secretary of State and the accompanying draft legislation to authorize an appropriation for a special contribution by the United States to the United Nations for the relief of Palestine refugees. In submitting this proposed legislation, I wish to invite attention to the provisions of the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations emphasizing the critical situation of these refugees and urging all states members of the United Nations to make voluntary contributions as soon as possible to meet their needs.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 27, 1949.

(Enclosures: Letter from the Acting Secretary of State; draft of proposed legislation; General Assembly resolution.)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 14, 1949.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

There is enclosed for your consideration and for transmission to the Congress, if you approve, a joint resolution to authorize an appropriation for a special contribution by the United States to the United Nations for the relief of Palestine refugees.

The purpose of this legislation is to give effect to a resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations of November 19, 1948, a copy of which is enclosed. The action of the General Assembly was based primarily upon the report of the Acting United Nations Mediator for Palestine of October 18, 1948, which described the situation of the 500,000 Palestinian refugees as extremely critical and urged immediate assistance for them to avert a great human catastrophe. The General Assembly, taking this situation into account, declared in its resolution—

that the alleviation of conditions of starvation and distress among the Palestine refugees is one of the minimum conditions for the success of the effort of the United Nations to bring peace to that land.

The resolution further states that a sum of approximately \$29,500,000 will be required to provide relief for 500,000 refugees for a period of 9

months from December 1, 1948, to August 31, 1949, and that an additional amount of approximately \$2,500,000 will be required for administrative and local operational expenses. To finance these requirements, the resolution—

urges all States Members of the United Nations to make as soon as possible voluntary contributions in kind or in funds sufficient to insure that the amount of supplies and funds required—

is obtained.

To provide immediate assistance pending the receipt of contributions, the General Assembly authorized the Secretary-General to advance \$5,000,000 from the United Nations Working Capital Fund, this advance to be repaid from the voluntary contributions of governments.

The proposed legislation provides for a special contribution of \$16,000,000 to the United Nations for the refugee-relief program. This amount is deemed to be a fair share for the United States to contribute in order to support the efforts of the United Nations in restoring peace in Palestine and in view of the deep interest of the United States in restoring conditions of stability in that area. To date, 15 countries have indicated that they will make contributions pursuant to the General Assembly resolution. Among these, the United Kingdom has announced a contribution of 1,000,000 pounds sterling (approximately \$4,000,000) and France a contribution of 500,000,000 French francs (approximately \$1,600,000).

The program will be administered by Mr. Stanton Griffis, who is taking leave from his post as United States Ambassador to Egypt to serve as Director of United Nations Relief for Palestine Refugees. With a view to utilizing personnel and organizations experienced in disaster relief, arrangements are being made with the International Committee of the Red Cross, the League of Red Cross Societies, and the American Friends Service Committee to handle the distribution of supplies in the field as agents of the United Nations.

The provision for an advance of \$8,000,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is designed to make a part of the United States contribution immediately available. Without this extraordinary provision, the normal delays in the appropriation process would make it impossible to meet the heaviest requirements of the relief program during the winter months.

¹ H. Doc. 46, 81st Cong., 1st sess.

Section 3 of the draft legislation is for the purpose of enabling the United Nations to procure material, supplies, or services for the purposes of the resolution through the facilities of United States Government agencies and to simplify the procedures for such procurement.

In view of the urgency of extending relief to these unfortunate peoples, and of the importance of the United States contribution to the United Nations program, I sincerely hope that the proposed legislation may be presented to the Congress for its consideration at the earliest opportunity.

ROBERT A. LOVETT.

(Enclosures: (1) Letter to the Congress, (2) draft of proposed legislation, (3) General Assembly resolution.)

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRD SESSION

Unrestricted
A/731
22 November 1948
Original: English
Dual Distribution

ASSISTANCE TO PALESTINE REFUGEES

Resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its 163rd plenary meeting on 19 November 1948

WHEREAS the problem of the relief of Palestine refugees of all communities is one of immediate urgency and the United Nations Mediator on Palestine in his progress report of 18 September 1948, part Three, states that "action must be taken to determine the necessary measures (of relief) and to provide for their implementation" and that "the choice is between saving the lives of many thousands of people now or permitting them to die";

WHEREAS the Acting Mediator, in his supplemental report of 18 October 1948, declares that "the situation of the refugees is now critical" and that "aid must not only be continued but very greatly increased if disaster is to be averted";

WHEREAS the alleviation of conditions of starvation and distress among the Palestine refugees is one of the minimum conditions for the success of the efforts of the United Nations to bring peace to that land,

The General Assembly

1. *Expresses* its thanks to the Governments and organizations which, and the individual persons who, have given assistance directly or in response to the Mediator's appeal;

2. *Considers*, on the basis of the Acting Mediator's recommendation, that a sum of approximately \$29,500,000 will be required to provide relief for 500,000 refugees for a period of nine months from 1 December 1948 to 31 August 1949, and that an additional amount of approximately \$2,500,000 will be required for administrative and local operational expenses;

3. *Authorizes* the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Advisory Committee on Adminis-

trative and Budgetary Questions, to advance immediately a sum of up to \$5,000,000 from the Working Capital Fund of the United Nations, the said sum to be repaid before the end of the period specified in paragraph 2, from the voluntary governmental contributions requested under paragraph 4;

4. *Urges* all States Members of the United Nations to make as soon as possible voluntary contributions in kind or in funds sufficient to ensure that the amount of supplies and funds required is obtained, and states that, to this end, voluntary contributions of non-member States would also be accepted; contributions in funds may be made in currencies other than the United States dollar, in so far as the operations of the relief organization can be carried out in such currencies;

5. *Authorizes* the Secretary-General to establish a Special Fund into which contributions shall be paid, which will be administered as a separate account;

6. *Authorizes* the Secretary-General to expend the funds received under paragraphs 3 and 4 of this resolution;

7. *Instructs* the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, to establish regulations for the administration and supervision of the Fund;

8. *Requests* the Secretary-General to take all necessary steps to extend aid to Palestine refugees and to establish such administrative organization as may be required for this purpose, inviting the assistance of the appropriate agencies of the several Governments, the specialized agencies of the United Nations, the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, the International Committee of the Red Cross, the League of Red Cross Societies and other voluntary agencies, it being recognized that the participation of voluntary organizations in the relief plan would in no way derogate from the principle of impartiality on the basis of which the assistance of these organizations is being solicited;

9. *Requests* the Secretary-General to appoint a Director of United Nations Relief for Palestine Refugees, to whom he may delegate such responsibility as he may consider appropriate for the overall planning and implementation of the relief programme;

10. *Agrees* to the convoking, at the discretion of the Secretary-General of an *ad hoc* advisory committee of seven members to be selected by the President of the General Assembly to which the Secretary-General may submit any matter of principle or policy upon which he would like the benefit of the Committee's advice;

11. *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue and to extend the implementation of the present relief programme, until the machinery provided for by the present resolution is set up;

12. *Urges* the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Refugee Organization, the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, and other appropriate organizations and agencies, acting within the framework of the relief programme herein established, promptly to contribute supplies, specialized personnel and other services permitted by their constitutions and their financial resources, to relieve the desperate plight of Palestine refugees of all communities;

13. *Requests* the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly, at the next regular session, on the action taken as a result of this resolution.

DRAFT OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

A Joint Resolution For The Authorization Of A Special Contribution By The United States To The United Nations For The Relief Of Palestine Refugees

WHEREAS the General Assembly of the United Nations in its resolution of November 19, 1948, has determined that "the problem of the relief of Palestine refugees of all communities is one of immediate urgency" and "that the alleviation of conditions of starvation and distress among the Palestine refugees is one of the minimum conditions for the success of the efforts of the United Nations to bring peace to that land;" and

WHEREAS the said resolution "urges all States Members of the United Nations to make as soon as possible voluntary contributions in kind or in funds sufficient to insure that the amount of supplies and funds required" for the relief of Palestine refugees is obtained: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the desire of the United States to cooperate fully with the United Nations in the establishment and maintenance of peace and stability in the Palestine area and in the alleviation of human suffering in that area, and, in order to effectuate such cooperation, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$16,000,000 as a special contribution by the United States to the United Nations for the purposes set forth in the Resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations of November 19, 1948. Payment of this contribution shall be made to the United Nations at such time and in such amounts as the Secretary of State may deem appropriate.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of any

other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to section 1, to make advances to the Secretary of State, not to exceed in the aggregate \$8,000,000, to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution. From appropriations authorized under section 1, there shall be repaid by the Secretary of State to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, without interest, the advances made by it under authority contained herein. No interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in implementation of this section.

SEC. 3. (a) Upon request of the United Nations for materials, supplies, or services for the purpose of carrying out the terms of the Resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations of November 19, 1948, the Secretary of State may transfer sums, as advancements or reimbursements, for the cost and expense therefor, from advances by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under section 2, from appropriations made under authority of section 1, and from funds made available to him by the United Nations for such purposes, to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government, including any corporation wholly owned by the United States (hereinafter referred to as "Government agency"), and any such Government agency shall furnish or procure and furnish such material, supplies, or services to the United Nations. Sums so transferred shall be available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with the laws governing obligations and expenditure in accordance with the laws governing obligations and expenditures of the Government agency to which funds are transferred and without regard to sections 3709 and 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5 and 31 U. S. C. 529) or to the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (Public Law 413, 80th Congress): *Provided*, That such additional civilian employees as may be required by any such Government Agency for the procurement or furnishing of supplies or services under this subsection shall not be counted as civilian employees within the meaning of Section 14 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946.

(b) When reimbursement is made under subsection (a) of this section, it shall be credited, at the option of the Government agency involved, either to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized in incurring the obligation, or to the appropriate appropriation, fund, or account which is current at the time of such reimbursement.

(This draft has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget.)

ILO Conventions and Recommendations Sent to the Senate

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT

The President on February 2 sent the following message to the Senate and a similar message to the House of Representatives:

To the Senate of the United States:

The Constitution of the International Labor Organization provides in Article 19 thereof, with respect to each convention and recommendation adopted at a session of the International Labor Conference, that "each of the members undertakes that it will," within a given period, bring the convention or recommendation "before the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies, for the enactment of legislation or other action."

In accordance with the above-mentioned obligations of the Government of the United States of America as a member of the International Labor Organization, I transmit herewith,¹ for the enactment of legislation or such other action as the Senate may consider appropriate, authentic texts of certain Conventions, an Instrument of Amendment, and Recommendations adopted at recent sessions of the International Labor Conference, as follows:

Convention (No. 81) concerning labor inspection in industry and commerce;

Convention (No. 82) concerning social policy in non-metropolitan territories;

Convention (No. 83) concerning the application of international labor standards to non-metropolitan territories;

Instrument for the amendment of the schedule to Convention (No. 83) concerning the application of international labor standards to non-metropolitan territories;

Convention (No. 84) concerning the right of association and the settlement of labor disputes in non-metropolitan territories;

Convention (No. 85) concerning labor inspectorates in non-metropolitan territories;

Convention (No. 86) concerning the maximum length of contracts of employment of indigenous workers;

Recommendation (No. 81) concerning labor inspection; and

Recommendation (No. 82) concerning labor inspection in mining and transport undertakings.

The Conventions and Recommendations listed above were adopted at the Thirtieth Session of the International Labor Conference at Geneva from June 19 to July 11, 1947. The Instrument of

Amendment was adopted by the Conference at its Thirty-first Session held at San Francisco from June 17 to July 10, 1948.

I transmit also the report of the Acting Secretary of State regarding the above-mentioned Conventions, Instrument of Amendment, and Recommendation and a letter of December 3, 1948 from the Acting Secretary of Labor to the Secretary of State regarding those documents.¹

I am requesting the Secretary of the Interior to transmit the above-mentioned Conventions, Instrument of Amendment, and Recommendations to the Governments of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands for the enactment of legislation or other action. I am transmitting those documents to the Secretary of the Navy for appropriate action and advice with respect to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory.

I am also referring the texts of the Conventions, Instrument of Amendment, and Recommendations to the House of Representatives.

HARRY S. TRUMAN

THE WHITE HOUSE,
February 2, 1949.

De Jure Recognition Extended to Transjordan

[Released to the press by the White House January 31]

For some time informal and friendly relations have existed between the United States Government and the Government of the Kingdom of Transjordan. Consistently with its feeling of friendship for Transjordan, the United States Government has supported that country for membership in the United Nations. On January 31 the United States Government extended *de jure* recognition to the Government of Transjordan.

De Jure Recognition Extended to Israel

[Released to the press by the White House January 31]

On October 24, 1948, the President stated that when a permanent government was elected in Israel, it would promptly be given *de jure* recognition. Elections for such a government were held on January 25. The votes have now been counted, and this Government has been officially informed of the results. The United States Government is therefore pleased to extend *de jure* recognition to the Government of Israel as of January 31.

¹ The accompanying documents are not here printed.

February 6, 1949

Extradition of Hungarian Refugees—Continued from page 197

embezzlement and, by carrying abroad some passengers against their will, they are guilty of the crime of violation of personal freedom.

The Hungarian Government propose to demand extradition of the crew by the American military authorities, Germany, for the said crimes.

Meanwhile, until formal request for delivery will be presented, the Hungarian Minister for Foreign Affairs would feel obliged if the Legation were good enough to request the competent American authorities to proceed to the arrest of the said criminals.

Reply by American Legation, Budapest

As the Minister for Foreign Affairs is probably aware, two crew members and two passengers of the Maszoviet plane which on January 4 landed in the United States zone of occupation in Germany elected to return to Hungary and departed from Munich at 1155 hours on January 12. It is the view of the Government of the United States that the remaining crew members involved in the flight of this plane are refugees whose objective was not "embezzlement" but, it appears, to flee from political oppression—an act which can in no way constitute a crime in the eyes of free peoples. While the Hungarian Government has expressed concern at the alleged crime of "violation of personal freedom," which the Hungarian Minister for Foreign Affairs defines as "carrying abroad some passengers against their will," the United States Government considers that it would be a violation of the personal freedom of these crew members if they were forced involuntarily to return to Hungary.

In the circumstances, the United States Government, in accordance with its traditional position in such matters, is not disposed to return these persons to Hungary against their will.

FOREIGN SERVICE

**Liberia and United States
Raise Legations to Embassies**

[Released to the press February 1, 1949]

The Governments of the United States and Liberia have agreed to raise their Legations in Monrovia and Washington to the status of Embassies. This change in the status of the two missions will become effective at the time the Ambassadors-designate of the two countries present their credentials.

PUBLICATIONS

Department of State

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

Universal Declaration of Human Rights. International Organization and Conference Series III, 20. Pub. 3381. 6 pp. 5¢.

Text of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as approved by the General Assembly at its plenary meeting on 10 December 1948.

National Commission News, January 1949. Pub. 3386. 10 pp. 10¢ a copy; \$1 a year domestic, \$1.35 a year foreign.

The monthly publication of the United States National Commission for UNESCO.

Coordinating Foreign Aid. Department and Foreign Service Series 5. Pub. 3392. 22 pp. 10¢.

Address by George C. McGhee, Coordinator for Aid to Greece and Turkey.

LEGISLATION

Amending the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 with respect to eligibility for appointment in the executive branch of the Government of former professional staff members of committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives. H. Rept. 5, 81st Cong., 1st sess. 1 p.

Extending the Time for Free Entry of Certain Articles Imported to Promote International Good Will. H. Rept. 6, 81st Cong., 1st sess. 2 pp.

The Palestine Situation: Adverse Report (To accompany H. Res. 50.) H. Rept. 10, 81st Cong., 1st sess. 5 pp.

The State of the Union: Address of the President of the United States delivered before a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the subject of the State of the Union. H. Doc. 1, 81st Cong., 1st sess. 7 pp.

Message from the President of the United States transmitting a report by the Acting Secretary of State, showing all receipts and disbursement on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948, in connection with the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System. H. Doc. 39, 81st Cong., 1st sess. 2 pp.

New Reorganization Measure. Message from the President of the United States transmitting his recommendation for the enactment of a new reorganization measure. H. Doc. 42, 81st Cong., 1st sess. 4 pp.

Communication from the President of the United States transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of \$480,702,340, together with certain proposed provisions and increases in limitations pertaining to existing appropriations. H. Doc. 44, 81st Cong., 1st sess. 25 pp.

Special Contribution by the United States to the United Nations for Relief of Palestine Refugees. Message from the President of the United States transmitting a letter from the Acting Secretary of State, and the accompanying draft legislation, to authorize an appropriation for a special contribution by the United States to the United Nations for the relief of Palestine refugees. H. Doc. 46, 81st Cong., 1st sess. 6 pp.

e
t
e
e
l
.
s
7
.
t
l
a

Contents

General Policy		Page	Economic Affairs		Page
An American Answer to Chinese Communist Propaganda. Address by John M. Cabot.		179	Opening of the International Wheat Conference. Statement by Charles F. Brannan		186
Comments on Premier Stalin's Answers to Questions Submitted by Kingsbury Smith. Remarks by Secretary Acheson.		192	European Broadcasting Conference: Brussels and Copenhagen. By Robert R. Burton		187
U.S. Refuses Extradition of Hungarian Refugees From U.S. Zone in Germany . . .		197	The United Nations and Specialized Agencies		
<i>De Jure</i> Recognition Extended to Transjordan		205	The U.S. in the U.N.		184
<i>De Jure</i> Recognition Extended to Israel. . .		205	South East Asia Regional Air Navigation Meeting. By Clifford P. Burton . . .		190
Liberia and United States Raise Legations to Embassies		206	Occupation Matters		
Treaty Information			Military Security Board for Western Zones of Germany:		
Opening of the International Wheat Conference. Statement by Charles F. Brannan		186	Establishment by U.S., U.K., and France.		195
European Broadcasting Conference: Brussels and Copenhagen. By Robert R. Burton		187	Directive on Organization		195
Growth of the Organization of American States. Statement by Secretary Acheson		198	International Information and Cultural Affairs		
U.S.-Canadian Agreement on Emergency Aircraft:			Uruguayan Musician To Study in U.S. . . .		194
Negotiations To Expedite International Boundary Crossing		200	Chilean Zoologist Visits in U.S.		194
Exchange of Notes		201	The Foreign Service		
ILO Conventions and Recommendations Sent to the Senate. Message of the President		205	Liberia and United States Raise Legations to Embassies		206
			Publications		
			Department of State.		206
			The Congress		
			Special Contribution by the United States to the United Nations for Relief of Palestine Refugees. Message of the President to the Congress		202
			Legislation		206

Contributors

Robert R. Burton, Chairman of the United States Delegation to the European Broadcasting Conference, is in the International Broadcasting Division, Department of State.

Clifford P. Burton, author of the article on the South East Asia Regional Air Navigation Meeting, is Chief of Technical Mission, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce. Mr. Burton served as Chairman of the United States Delegation to this meeting.